

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1 and 3-48 are pending. Claims 1 and 3-22 are amended. No new matter is added.

Amendments to the Specification

The Specification has been amended herein to correct a typographical error in which a send button was identified by element number 310 instead of the proper element number from Figure 3, element 306.

Applicants note that the Office Action indicates that the Summary of the Invention is missing. However, a Summary of the Invention is not required. As indicated in 37 CFR 1.53, a specification containing a written description of the invention and at least one claim must be submitted. A Summary of the Invention is not specifically identified as a requirement. Exemplary language to support this notion may be found in 37 CFR 1.75 where it is indicated that the specification must conclude with a claim. Contrast that with the language of 37 CFR 1.73 in which it is indicated that a Summary of the Invention should precede the detailed description, merely indicating its preferable location (if included). 37 CFR 1.73 further states that “[s]uch a summary should, when set forth, be commensurate with the invention as claimed. . . .” Thus, 37 CFR 1.73 clearly indicates that a Summary of the Invention is not required.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

The Office Action indicates that the independent claims call for a computer implemented method, but asserts that the specification provides operations that are implemented by a human.

It appears the Office Action is lending an interpretation to the phrase “computer implemented” that is unwarranted by the common understanding in the art and as read in light of the specification. The fact that a method may be assisted in some way by

user input/interaction does not mean that the method is not computer implemented. The Specification shows the various methods of the invention as implemented in or by a computer in numerous locations throughout the Specification and Figures. Claims 1 and 3-22 have also been amended herein to clarify the purpose of independent claims 1, 13, and 20 and the claims dependent therefrom as being directed to computer implemented operations or operations that are performed/enabled by a computing device.

The Office Action also objects to use of the term “automatically,” which appears in independent claims 13, 20, and 37, as well as various dependent claims. For example, independent claim 13 provides for the automatic association of one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more identified text elements to provide contextualization of at least one of the electronic mail message and the one or more text elements upon determining that the identified one or more text elements correspond to the identified context. Support for these features may be found in the Specification at page 8, lines 2-6; page 16, line 15 to page 18, line 10, and Figure 7, as well as elsewhere throughout the Specification. The above-mentioned portions of the Specification indicate that the association of the qualifiers with the text elements may be manual or automatic. The automatic association may be enabled through a variety of embodiments, for example, the use of one or more lookup or symbol tables to determine whether the identified element(s) are known to exist in the applicable context, and if so, the association of the elements with one or more qualifiers to contextualize the message. The Specification makes it clear that the term “automatic” is directed specifically to an operation that does not require additional user input (see for example page 8, line 3 and page 16, lines 19-20). Further, the term “automatic” has a clear and understood meaning in the art as supported by the description in the Specification.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that the claims are sufficiently enabled and thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7-9, 18-19, 21, 31-33, 42-43, and 45 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action requests an indication of support in the Specification and drawings.

Claims 7-9 and 31-33 are directed to, for example, aggregating at least a subset of the one or more elements based upon one or more semantic associations. The Specification indicates that rules or policies may be established, for example to aggregate/group content, which may, in an embodiment, be searchable. Support for the aggregation operations recited in the claims may be found in the Specification at page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 2 and page 12, line 17 to page 13, line 3, as well is in the claims as originally filed.

Claims 18-19, 21, 42-43, and 45 are directed to, for example, identifying a set of attributes associated with the one or more text elements and displaying the attributes to a user, as well as other functions of the attributes. Support for the use of attributes may be found in the Specification, for example, at page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 2; page 17, line 11 to page 19, line 2; and Figure 6b, as well as in the claims as originally filed.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over US Patent No. 7,028,075 to Morris (Morris) in view of US Patent No. 6,199,081 to Meyerzon et al. (Meyerzon). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 1 provides a computer implemented method comprising determining by a computing device a context to be applied to an electronic mail message; identifying by a computing device one or more elements within the electronic mail message based at least in part upon the context; and associating by a computing device one or more semantic qualifiers with the one or more elements to provide contextualization of at least a portion of the electronic mail message.

The Office Action cites Morris for teaching that one may create an HTML email message. The Office Action further cites Meyerzon for teaching that HTML documents may contain metadata and metatags. However, Morris and Meyerzon, alone or in combination, fail to teach at least one feature of claim 1, and thus claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

The cited portion of Morris is Column 5, lines 34-38, which recites “[i]n an alternate embodiment, the photomail server 20 creates an HTML email message 31 to send and imbeds links 33 to scaled-down versions of the sent images 21. The recipient may thus view the resulting photo album in his/her normal email program 38.” As indicated by the citation above, Morris is directed to a system for sharing digital images over the Internet and thus has nothing to do with semantic qualification of messages. This citation merely indicates that email messages may be transmitted in an HTML format.

The cited portion of Meyerzon is Column 1, lines 35-44, which recites “[a] HTML document contains text and tags. HTML documents may also contain metadata and metatags. Metadata is data about data and metatags define the meta-data. Examples of metatags that identify meta-data are ‘author,’ ‘language,’ and ‘character set.’ HTML documents may also include tags that contain embedded ‘links’ or ‘hyperlinks’ that reference other data or documents located on the same or another Web server computer. The HTML documents and the document referenced in the hyperlinks may include text, graphics, audio, or video in various formats.” This citation merely indicates that HTML documents may include metadata and metatags.

Thus, if combined, Morris and Meyerzon would provide an HTML email document/message containing metadata/metatags. However, such a description falls short of teaching all the features of claim 1.

Claim 1 provides in the first recited operation that a context is determined for the message. At no point in either Morris or Meyerzon is there provided a context for a message or document. As used in the present Specification, a context describes the framework for the message, such as “related to an episode of care” or “medical-related” which helps categorize the message and distinguish the message from another context

(for example, one dealing with a billing issue, personnel, etc.). The Office Action is silent on this point. As described in the present Specification (and recited in claim 1 as discussed below), the determination of the context (for example, related to an episode of care) in turn identifies or facilitates in the identification of the elements to which a semantic qualifier may be associated. As recited in claim 1, the particular elements within the message (for example, words in the message) may be identified based on this context (the categorization of the type of message). Thus, as an example, if a message is related to an episode of care, the particular identified elements may include the patient's name, chief complaint, etc. It is those items that are "based at least in part upon the context" and thus may be associated with the one or more semantic qualifiers.

Morris and Meyerzon do not provide for the determination of a context to be applied to a message and thus do also do not provide for the identification of one or more elements within the message based at least in part upon the context. These features in concert with the association of semantic qualifiers allow for the contextualization desired.

Thus, based on the different functions and the different results derived therefrom, Morris and Meyerzon clearly fail to teach all the features of claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentable over Morris and Meyerzon.

Independent claims 13, 20, 25, 37, and 44 contain language similar to that of claim 1 and thus are patentable over Morris and Meyerzon for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Claims 3-12, 14-19, 21-24, 26-36, 38-43, and 45-48 depend from claims 1, 13, 20, 25, 37, or 44, directly or indirectly, and are thus patentable over Morris and Meyerzon for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 3-48 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account
No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 01/28/2008

/Steven J. Prewitt/
Steven J. Prewitt
Reg. No. 45023

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503)222-9981